

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 27, 2006. Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 9, 11 to 14, 21 to 24 and 26 to 29 are in the application, of which Claims 1, 6, 11, 21 and 26 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 4, 6 to 9 and 11 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,960,406 (Rasansky) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,788,429 (Clough). Claims 5, 10 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Rasansky in view of Clough, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,973 (Levine).

Turning to specific claim language, amended independent Claim 1 is directed to an information processing apparatus which includes a receiving unit adapted to receive a request from an external apparatus; a generation unit adapted to generate, in response to a received request from the external apparatus, print data corresponding to a preview displayed on a display screen on the external apparatus; a selecting unit adapted to select a print server to transmit the generated print data from plural print servers, wherein the print server is selected in accordance with the external apparatus; a first obtaining unit adapted to obtain instructions for printing via the display screen on the external apparatus; a transmission control unit adapted to control transmission so that the print data generated by the generation unit is transmitted to a print server selected by the selecting unit in response to the obtaining unit for obtaining instructions for printing; a second obtaining unit adapted to obtain, when the print server can transmit data to a plurality of printers, status information on the plurality of printers; and a selection control unit adapted to

prohibit, based on the status information, an unusable printer from being selected by the external apparatus.

In contrast, Rasansky discloses a computer system for scheduling events between end users. The computer system is a centralized server that serves HTML documents. (See Rasansky Fig. 7, (950), Col. 2, Lines 8 to 13, and Col. 8, Lines 7 to 16.) However, Rasansky neither discloses nor suggests at least the features of a second obtaining unit adapted to obtain, when the print server can transmit data to a plurality of printers, status information on the plurality of printers and a selection control unit adapted to prohibit, based on the status information, an unusable printer from being selected by the external apparatus as featured in Claim 1.

Furthermore, Clough discloses choosing a print server for managing a print queue. (See Clough, elements 16 of Fig. 1 and Col. 4, Lines 30 to 41.) However, Clough fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of a second obtaining unit adapted to obtain, when the print server can transmit data to a plurality of printers, status information on the plurality of printers and a selection control unit adapted to prohibit, based on the status information, an unusable printer from being selected by the external apparatus as featured in Claim 1.

Finally, Levine discloses obtaining status information on a plurality of printers. (See Levine, Col. 11, Lines 1-8.)) However, Levine fails to disclose or suggest at least the features of a second obtaining unit adapted to obtain, when the print server can transmit data to a plurality of printers, status information on the plurality of printers and a selection control unit adapted to prohibit, based on the status information, an unusable printer from being selected by the external apparatus as featured in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicant submits that Rasansky, Clough and Levine, either alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 1. Specifically, Rasansky, Clough and Levine each fail to disclose or suggest the features of a second obtaining unit adapted to obtain, when the print server can transmit data to a plurality of printers, status information on the plurality of printers and a selection control unit adapted to prohibit, based on the status information, an unusable printer from being selected by the external apparatus. Accordingly, even if Rasansky, Clough and Levine are combined, which Applicant does not concede is permissible, the combination would also fail to disclose or suggest these features.

In light of the deficiencies of Rasansky, Clough and Levine as discussed above, Applicant submits that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claims 6, 11, 21 and 26 are directed to a system, a method, a computer-readable recording medium and a computer-readable recording medium, respectively, substantially in accordance with the apparatus of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Claims 6, 11, 21 and 26 are also now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

The other claims in the application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and therefore are believed to be allowable over the applied references for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, CA office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank Cire #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicant

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA_MAIN 129615v1